THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX MARCH, 1956 No. 429

Editorial

IT is often said that preaching in the Church of England is nowadays on a low level, but who is in a position to say whether or not it is so? With few exceptions the clergy have first-hand experience only of the sermons which they preach themselves, and this must be particularly the case with bishops. Among the exceptions are those clergymen who serve in universities and in cathedral or collegiate churches. Not being tied to the regular occupancy of a parochial pulpit, they have more or less frequent opportunities of sitting at the feet of their brethren in the ministry; but, even if they avail themselves of these opportunities to the full, they have scarcely enough evidence on which to base reliable generalizations. As for those lay men and women who hear many sermons, we have for long been struck by their uncritical attitude towards them. Regular churchgoers listen with apparently appreciative attention to discourses that beggar description! It is as though they regard with admiration the fact that a man should be able to remain on his feet for ten or fifteen minutes and go on talking all the time. This is borne out by a thing we have noticed again and again, namely, that candidates for ordination at their initial sermon classes, when asked to give their candid opinion of what they have just heard, will with evident sincerity pay the homage of enthusiastic applause to allocutions which, judged by objective standards, would be deemed mediocre or indifferent, not to say plainly bad!

It would be good for preachers as well as for their hearers if sermons were viewed more critically, if more were manifestly expected of them by everyone concerned, and if a lively and embarrassing come-back could usually be expected. Certainly there is no preacher worth his salt but owns that he has an immense amount to learn about how to preach and would welcome perceptive and acute comments from members of his auditory. More opportunities might be provided for the making of such comments and more encouragement given to those who might make them. But there are other ways in which standards of preaching could be raised.

We do not know that a systematic study has ever been made of the methods employed in our anglican theological colleges to teach ordinands how to preach, nor of how they compare with the methods employed in nonconformist colleges. It is possible that there are deficiencies here, and that much wholesome instruction might be derived from such a comparative study. For example, are our anglican colleges sure that their own "preaching class canons" are as exacting and as effective as those of the late Dr J. B. Paton which we publish this month?

Then, ever since we were allowed to be present at a course at the College of Preachers, Washington, D.C.,[1] we have been confident that a similar institution in this country would be a boon to the whole Church. We hope the time will come when a theological college is turned over to this purpose. We are glad to hear that St Augustine's College, Canterbury, as part of its "International Summer Courses for the Clergy", which are advertised elsewhere in this issue, is taking a modest step in the right direction.

Meanwhile, we are left to depend on what help can be had from preaching literature. A number of publications under this head are before us at the moment. The methodists are to be congratulated on having recently started a *Preacher's Quarterly*[2] which contains not sermons but articles on the many varied aspects of preaching. Anyone who needs his sense revived of the tremendous importance of preaching and of its divine possibilities will also read with advantage two recently published lectures: *Prophetic Preaching* by Dr E. Gordon Rupp,[3] and *Lending our Words to the Word* by Dr Norman Goodall.[4] In both these cases much is finely and memorably said in a short space.

It is likely, however, that hard-pressed preachers will turn more hopefully for light upon their path to published examples of sermons that have actually been preached. In comparison with the practice of the 19th century, the publication of sermons is now a rare phenomenon. We are therefore interested to see that Messrs A. R. Mowbray and Co. have embarked on a "Sermons of To-day Series". The first volume to appear is entitled *Faith and Work* by the Bishop of Bristol.[5] No sermons could be less pretentious: there are no flowers of rhetoric here, and little eloquence. Dr Cockin's great virtue is that he resolutely keeps his ear to the ground. He realizes that the preacher must not only be convinced by the truth of his message but must also know and sympathize with the dispositions and the inhibitions of those whom he seeks to address. Moreover, Dr Cockin is always seeking to address—beyond those who are safely (perhaps too safely) within the fold—men who are on the frontiers of the Church and who find not so much that most preaching is above their heads as that it fails to connect with their state and frame of mind and way of life. It is as though the preacher said, "This one thing I am set upon: I am determined that what I say shall mean something to those before me, shall reach them and give them a thinking-point."

Dr Cockin's other great merit, which is the correlative of what has just been said, is his realization that Christian faith must be shown and found to illuminate the problems, the tensions, and the frustrations that lay men and women encounter in the workaday and extra-ecclesiastical areas of their lives. One of his sermons is entitled "The Service of God in Church and State", and he rightly emphasizes

[1] See American Letter, No. 18, by Eric Montizambert in THEOLOGY, May 1954.
[2] Epworth Press. 13s. 6d. per annum.
[3] Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture, 1954. Berean Press, Birmingham. 2s.
[4] Frank Broughton Memorial Lecture, 1955. Independent Press. 7s.
[5] Mowbray. 8s. 6d.

that the Church *as such* can and ought to occupy only a very small proportion of the ordinary layman's time and energy and interest. There is no greater need to-day than that we should discover what it means to serve God in what some call "the secular order". Dr Cockin's hearers will at least have begun to suspect, very likely for the first time, that such pulpit themes as Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection, the Holy Spirit, and the Judgment, have a vital bearing on what is happening to men and women, and to communities and nations, here and now.

The aim and tone of this volume—its sober down-to-earthiness and its freedom from unexamined clichés and from taking too much for granted—should then be studied and emulated. At the same time we think Dr Cockin might without loss give more attention to the proper arts of preaching, as he well knew how to do before he was a bishop. Most of these sermons—"talks" would generally be the more appropriate word both on account of their shape and length—are loose in structure, and they show a surprising lack of fertility in illustration. We should have expected him to display a greater capacity for reaching the imagination as well as the intelligence of his hearers, though the printed word doubtless loses in this connexion something that the personal presence supplied. He says in the foreword that his "natural tendency to colloquialism may be rather more than usually prominent": in our opinion it is not nearly prominent enough, where it would be most in place. On the other hand, where a closer concern for dignity of style and distinction of phrase would be in place (e.g. in a sermon preached before the British Association), Dr Cockin can not only utter but pass in print a sentence like this: "I need not say that I am not so foolish or presumptuous as to imagine that I can more than very partially understand, still less pass critical judgment on, matters which, even to those best qualified to speak on them, would appear to involve a number of points which are still somewhat obscure."

Faith and Work is really prolegomena to forthright proclamation and to the preaching of sermons in the grand, traditional sense, which is the sense also envisaged by Dr Rupp and Dr Goodall. But Dr Cockin would be entirely justified in saying that we have got to work away at the prolegomena for a long time yet, before more advanced theological preaching can be expected to have free course again. For specimens of contemporary preaching of that kind to a settled Germanic congregation, we can recommend Dr Emil Brunner's volume *The Great Invitation: Zürich Sermons*.[1] This is a collection of sermons, admirably translated by Mr Harold Knight, that were preached in the Fraumünster at Zürich and that Dr Brunner was asked to publish before he left his congregation in order to take up an appointment at the International Christian University at Tokyo. Few congregations in the Church of England would at present appreciate sermons of such solid theological quality —and of such length! But it would be a worth-while task for any English preacher to wrestle with the problem of how to say the kind

[1] Lutterworth Press. 15s.

of things that Dr Brunner says and at the same time to "get it across".

In conclusion, we can give a pointer to the way in which it may be done. For a course of Advent addresses broadcast by Dr A. C. Craig—*God Comes Four Times*[1]—is a beautiful example of doctrinal preaching in a thoroughly English (+Scottish) idiom.

Fundamentalism[2]

"God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets, by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son."—Heb. 1. 1 and 2.

SINCE the last Islington Conference there has been much loose and ill-informed talk about "Fundamentalism". The occasion was the imputation of the preaching of Fundamentalism levelled against the successful mass-evangelism of Dr Billy Graham, who, incidentally, has disowned "the soft impeachment". As, therefore, in this New Year of 1956, we meet when the tide of faith is running ever more strongly back to the Churches, it is imperative that the Evangelical School should give an unequivocal answer with regard to this obscure and misleading label of Fundamentalism. Thereby, through the recognition of its fundamental error, we shall hold ever more firmly the fundamental truth that "every Scripture *is* inspired by God"; which is still the marginal reading of the Revised Version, and upheld by Dr Walter Lock in his commentary on 2 Tim. 3. 16.

The issue is one of fundamental evangelistic and pastoral importance. On the one hand, if a man-made theory of Inspiration is exalted into a "fundamental" article of faith, then a new and exclusive Bible sect is engendered which cannot, on principle, have co-operation, or even fellowship, with other Christians in worship, work, or witness. On the other hand, if we are to buy up the opportunity of a Day of God, then it is essential that every man of God should be "furnished completely unto every good work" with the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word (or the *spoken utterance*) of God (2 Tim. 3. 16; cp. Eph. 6. 17). I would therefore (God helping me) examine with you:

First, the history of Fundamentalism.

Secondly, the error of Fundamentalism, in its latest guise of Literalism.

And thirdly, the Scriptural truth as to the inspiration of the Bible.

1. *In tracing the history of Fundamentalism*, the recent and massive *History of the Ecumenical Movement* reminds us that, in origin, the word denoted a mighty purpose that Archbishop William

---

[1] S.C.M. Press. 3s.

[2] Sermon preached at the Islington Conference on 10 January 1956, in St Margaret's Church, Westminster.

Temple, in 1942, rejoiced had become "the great new fact of our era".

During the 16th and 17th centuries there were periodic attempts to compile so-called "Fundamental Articles of Faith" which should include all Reformation Churches. To be thus "fundamental", it was laid down that such Articles must fulfil three conditions. They must be *essential* (in contradistinction to *secondary*) doctrines. They must, also, claim the *clear* revelation of God. And, in addition, they must possess the *undisputed* acceptance of the Churches.

Such true fundamentalism includes, to-day, the Articles of the Creed, together with the Sixth Article of Religion: seeing that (to quote Bishop Headlam's Visitation Charge of 1924) "the fundamental doctrine of the Church of England is the supremacy of Scripture".

In accordance with this fundamental basis, the World Council of Churches came to fulfilment, despite the World War; the Church of South India was born on 27 September 1947; the Archbishop of Canterbury, two years ago, blessed the Greater-London Mission of a Baptist Evangelist from America; and the Church Assembly, last July, advocated ecumenical co-operation on both an international and a parochial level.

During the present century, however, this truly Catholic word "Fundamentalism" began to be misapplied in America to indicate the narrow obscurantism of an exclusive cult. Between the years 1909 and 1912, I myself, among tens of thousands of others in this country, received a series of twelve little yellow, paper-covered books entitled *The Fundamentals*. They emanated from a wealthy group of strict Baptists in America; and they included, as a fundamental article of faith, "the verbal inerrancy of Holy Scripture". Therefrom, the term "Fundamentalist" arose, and later spread across the Atlantic, to designate those who regarded as fundamental an interpretation of inspiration that possesses neither divine revelation, nor Scriptural warrant, nor yet Church authority.

Since the First World War Fundamentalists have been compelled, twice over, to change the ground of their adherence to a verbally inerrant Bible; and that in the light both of cold fact and of the most elementary scholarship, however cautious and conservative.

Thus, it was recognized that a verbally inerrant Word of God did not exist. The Christian scribes of the first centuries, who copied the earliest manuscripts of the Holy Scriptures, seemed to have been entirely unaware of the fundamental necessity (newly discovered in the 20th century) of verbal inspiration for God's revelation to man. Even as early as A.D. 250, so innumerable were not only their copyist errors, but also their emendations and extraneous interpolations, that Origen failed to discover any true text for his gigantic Hexapla.

In consequence, the "verbal inerrancy" of the Bible came to be explained as the "plenary inspiration of the original documents". And it was on this assumption that the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society was founded in 1922, with its basis: "Scripture is the unerring Revelation of God."

But, again, where were these "original documents", thus inspired

to a plenary degree, and as such fundamental to make us "wise unto salvation"? Those Alexandrine scholars did not possess them, two centuries before Christ, who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into the Greek Septuagint, which, despite all its numerous verbal errancies, is yet so copiously quoted in the New Testament. Nor yet did St Jerome for his Vulgate translation of the whole Bible, in the 4th century A.D. But if the "plenary inspiration of the original documents" was fundamental for "the unerring Revelation of God", then the inspired inerrancy of every copyist would have been equally fundamental for their preservation. Faced with this inescapable dilemma, Fundamentalism has, lately, changed its ground once more, to be "Literalism", that is, everything in the Bible is *literally* true. Such, then, is the history of the term "Fundamentalism".

2. *In the second place, the crude conception of Literalism will point to the fundamental error of Fundamentalism.*

Literalism postulates the *scientific exactitude* of the *Hymn of Creation.* Thus, as that eminent Victorian zoologist, and Plymouth Brother, P. H. Gosse, F.R.S. (the father of Sir Edmund Gosse), explained, the world was actually created in a week, though made to seem incredibly old: a Brummagem antique, in fact; as if, snorted Charles Kingsley, Almighty God would write an almighty lie across his universe.

Again, Literalism asserts the *historicity* of the mythology of *Adam and Eve.* In consequence, a recent fundamentalist commentary is so concerned to speculate how a snake could talk with a woman that it misses the profound significance of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil in God's revelation of Original Sin. Likewise, Literalism is so obsessed with the *"great fish"* in the historical drama of Jonah that it is blind to the amazing inspiration of an Old Testament Scripture that comes the nearest to our Lord's own teaching on the universal out-reach of the Love of God, which includes the animal creation.

More than all, *in the moral sphere,* Literalism often demands of us belief in a God who is not the God and Father mirrored in the face of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Thus, Literalism accepts that "the angel of the Lord" brackets together, as "blessed above women", the Mother of Jesus, and Jael, the treacherous murderess who violated her own sacred code of hospitality (Judg. 5. 24). Literalism, also, maintains that the Holy Spirit, through the Psalmist, accounts as "happy" warriors those who should dash out the brains of Babylonian babies against a wall (Ps. 137. 9). Again, to take but one further example, Literalism approves the story of Yahweh, the Lord himself, tempting David to number the people in order that he might appease his anger against Israel by being able to punish them with a pestilence that destroyed 70,000 of these "innocent sheep", as the king mourned them (2 Sam. 24). This, however, was more than the priestly compiler of *Chronicles* could stomach, some six centuries later; for he deliberately alters David's tempter to Satan, not God; though otherwise his account is largely identical with that in the second book of Samuel

(1 Chron. 21. 1). Higher criticism can thus be shown to be at work even in the "unerring Revelation" itself of the Bible Churchman.

Literalism is the last ditch of Fundamentalism; and it is so obviously, and even profanely, untenable that it impels the question why are good people prepared to go to such fantastic lengths, and even to degrade God's Holy Word into the mechanically inspired dictation of automatic writing, in order to retain this impossible shibboleth of the "verbal inerrancy of Holy Scripture"? The answer is as old as the Golden Calf in the history of Israel. When, in an intrusively material world, Almighty God reveals himself as Spirit; and when he thus demands that man, despite his earthbound bodily senses, must worship in spirit and truth (John 4. 24)—that is, by man's human spirit meeting with Divine Spirit—then there arises in the human heart an insistent longing for some focalized and external religious authority, at which he can actually point, and to which he can with assurance resort. More especially, during times of insecurity, such as our own, does this demand for absolute and convincing certainty become paramount.

Hence the inevitable fascination of an infallible Church or an infallible Bible. But as the Christology of the New Testament sets forth (as in my text), the one and only infallible authority for Faith and Life is the Mind of Christ himself. To discover that Mind, first and foremost we "search the Scriptures" (John 5. 39), for they are God's divinely inspired and final record of the things of Christ. We also, subordinately, seek it in the traditions of the Church, to which the Holy Spirit was promised that he might take of the things of Christ and reveal them unto us (John 16. 15). But the Bible is not authoritative in isolation from Christ, the Eternal Word; any more than is the Church in isolation from Christ, the Head of the Church: even as the Reformation protested.

The fundamentalism of the Scribes and Pharisees, with their infallible Law, occasioned their rejection of the Messiah.

The fundamentalism of Judaizers in the New Testament Church—as also the fundamentalism of the casting of lots, and of Tongues and Miracles which the Early Church discarded—is sufficient warning that we must steadfastly continue to walk by faith and not by sight. An infallible Scripture can as effectively supplant the mediatorial lordship of Christ, the Living Word, as an infallible Church (1 Tim. 2. 6), and you can see it happening in the *apartheid* teaching of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa. Such insistence on verbal inspiration is to exalt God's Word written as of equal authority with the Son of God himself. In a word, the fundamental error of fundamentalism is Biblioatry.

3. *In the third place, therefore, let the Holy Scriptures themselves inform us of their fundamental importance in God's revelation of himself to man.*

"God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets, by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son." The Epistle to the Hebrews is one of the greatest and most closely reasoned books in the New Testa-

ment. It opens with a Hebrew of Hebrews, saturated in the Old Testament Scriptures, making two comparisons with regard to divine revelation. He compares the inspired human writers of Holy Scripture with the Son of God, Very God of Very God. He also compares God's Word Written with the revelation of the Eternal Word.

(1) *First, the writers.* They were "*men*", who "spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1. 21). That is, in their speaking they were the pen-men, not the pens, of God. Quite obviously inspiration has not swamped their personalities, which are stamped indelibly on their sacred writings. This means that in comparison with the Son of God himself the medium through which the revelation of God is given in the Scriptures is human, and therefore finite. As Origen has expressed the truth, as with the Person of the Incarnate Word himself, the Bible possesses two natures, a divine nature and a human nature; and we may not separate the one from the other. Thus Scriptures never claim to be the actual *words* of God; though we light on whole passages of such absolute goodness, truth, and beauty that we can only acclaim their perfection as a veritable "Thus saith the Lord". Instead the Bible *as a whole* is the Word of God; and it is the way of salvation perfectly revealed unto men when crowned with the absolute Revelation of the Word made Flesh.

(2) *Then also there are the writings themselves.* The order of the words in the Greek of my text fixes emphatic attention on the truth that the pre-Christian revelation was conditioned both by the contemporary environment and also by the personal genius of their inspired authors. They were written in many different portions, or periods, of Hebrew history, and also in many different modes, or media of communication; as compared with the final and unified revelation when, in fulness of time, God sent forth his Son (Gal. 4. 4).

(*a*) *Thus, as regards the multiform writings of the Old Testament,* it is a library of thirty-nine books consisting of poetry, allegory, drama and aphorisms, history and biography, law, prophesy and philosophy. Each book, therefore, must be understood according to its particular mode, or medium, of divine revelation. It is merely stupid to make them what they are not, or to force them into one pattern of Literalism, as if God had purposed to dictate text-books for scientists or anthropologists.

(*b*) *Of even greater consequence is the immense period of time* over which the Scriptures of the pre-Christian era were produced: more than a thousand years, if we calculate from the Exodus (*c.* 1230 B.C.) to the story of Esther, written less than a century and a half before Christ. It is utterly misleading to describe the inspiration of the Old Testament as "Progressive Revelation"; as if God's self-revelation can ever be less than perfect and complete. No! it is the spiritual *apprehension* of mortal man that is progressive. Thus the Hebrew Scriptures are the record of the plenary inspiration of a progressively spiritual apprehension in man, preparing the way for the perfect and complete revelation of God in Christ; so that, in

Westcott's phrase, "there is nothing in the Old Testament which is not taken up and transfigured in the New".

At the same time I would venture to demur from Westcott's description of this preparatory revelation as being "imperfect", even when compared with that of the Eternal Word himself. Origen's insight provides the right word—namely, "immature". Immaturity implies no imperfection, but only what is relatively, and appropriately, perfect for any one particular age. Even, therefore, as the Word made Flesh, when a boy, "grew in wisdom", so, likewise, down the pre-Christian centuries, did the spiritual apprehension of the inspired men of old time grow in the knowledge and love of God.

In conclusion, we cannot forget that our Lord Jesus Christ himself was on earth the Man of a Book, and that Book the Old Testament. Let me, then, sum up by quoting from an address by my own father (Bishop F. J. Chavasse of Liverpool) to the Islington Conference of 1927, the year before he died, on how we are to accept, use, and read the Old Testament Scriptures.

On the one hand, he bade us "*accept* it as Christ accepted it—as a spiritual book to reveal God; and we must *use* it, as he used it—as his manual of devotion, his armoury for the defence of the truth, and his final court of appeal".

On the other hand, he continued, "we must *read* it as explained, corrected, spiritualized and developed by our Lord's own teaching". If we will so do, then the manifold human voices of this composite library we call the Bible, speaking "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost", down many long periods of growing spiritual apprehension, and through many varied media of divine communication, all lose themselves in the one great Voice of the Word of God. That Voice of God, moreover, is a Living Voice; for from out of the sacred page there emerges the Christ himself, he who is alive for evermore; "and beginning from Moses and all the prophets", he interprets to us "*in all* the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24. 27).

CHRISTOPHER ROFFEN:

The Gospels and the Life of Jesus

DR VINCENT TAYLOR has now published in an expanded form the second series of Speaker's Lectures which he delivered in Oxford in 1952–3.[1] The book is intended as the second volume of a trilogy on the general subject of N.T. Christology, being a sequel to the author's first set of Speaker's Lectures, *The Names of Jesus*,[2] and a prelude to his third series on "The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching". Dr Taylor tells us that he felt it necessary to produce such a study in preparation for his Christological lectures because he has for some years now been convinced "that Christology cannot be effectively studied unless we can give an intelligible account of the life and ministry of Jesus as they are revealed in the Gospels" (p. v).

[1] *The Life and Ministry of Jesus* (Macmillan, 1954), 12s. 6d.
[2] See THEOLOGY, December 1953, pp. 476 f.

This quotation gives exactly the program of the book; it is not a full-scale "Life of Jesus", as that term was understood in the 19th century, but a study in fifty-two brief chapters which seeks to show that the Gospels, if submitted to an honest and fearless, but at the same time reasonable and untendentious, criticism, yield a picture of the life and work of Jesus which is historically consistent and intelligible. Dr Taylor recognizes that a certain amount of "reading between the lines" (p. 36) is necessary in the process of deriving such an account from the Gospels, for he realizes that many things which we are likely to regard as vital in such an account fall quite outside the scope of the Evangelists' interests; but his study convinces him that the Gospel account, and the Marcan outline in particular, "gives", so far as it goes, "a convincing summary of the outstanding events in the life of Jesus" (p. 39). For this statement, which forms the basis on which his book is constructed, he does not himself produce arguments, but refers to discussions by Burkitt, Dodds and others which will already be familiar to many readers (p. 39, n. 2). Where he seeks to supplement the Evangelists' account, it is mainly by attempting to penetrate a little further into the consciousness of Jesus—a truly human consciousness, as he rightly insists against all forms of Docetism—and to see how the various stages of the ministry evolved out of one another in his mind and purpose. He is convinced that "during the ministry as well as in youth . . . 'he [*sc.* Jesus] grew in wisdom as in age'" (p. 76) and that it is possible to trace something of that growth; but he knows very well where to draw the line in such an attempt. He does not forget that it is the Christ of God whose human life he is describing; "we cannot see the Jesus of history", he writes, "if we close our eyes to the Christ of faith" (p. 36).

In its general outlines the account Dr Taylor provides is not novel; it is one with which some readers may already be familiar from Dr Taylor's own earlier writings and from those of some other scholars. It assumes, as we have seen, the general historical accuracy of Mark's order, which it supplements for the Jerusalem ministry from the other Gospels, including John's. It assumes a development which can be traced in the Lord's mind, and in particular a decisive change of policy in the course of the ministry, after which the Lord concentrated on instructing the disciples about the true nature of his work and suffering. The phrase "Son of Man" is given a communal interpretation (though Dr Taylor is not wholly without reservations on this point, p. 73), and the Lord's preference for that term and his efforts to hide his Messiahship (Dr Taylor does not regard the "Messianic secret" as wholly an invention of the Evangelists) are due to the fact that his understanding of the Messianic rôle, based primarily on Isa. 53, was so different from the popular expectation that no good could have come of his accepting acknowledgement as Messiah in the popular sense. Indeed, in Dr Taylor's view it is precisely such popular misunderstanding, and consequent failure to respond to the *real* demands of the kingdom, which provide the guiding thread to almost the entire ministry, and explain

the developing purpose of Jesus. For example, in connexion with the ending of the Galilean ministry Dr Taylor writes (p. 114): ". . . of declining popularity at this period there is no sign. . . . It is not a waning popularity which compels Jesus to regard the Galilean ministry as a failure, and which drives him into seclusion. It is the popularity itself and, above all, its facile character." And this has the greater importance, because, by driving Jesus into seclusion,[1] it provided the occasion for that full realization of a suffering destiny which determined the rest of his ministry.

Many other points in Dr Tayor's account clamour for mention, for example his treatment in Chapter XXIV of the mission of the Twelve (Mark 6), which he interprets in the light of Matt. 10. The disciples, he thinks, were sent, not on a "simple evangelistic tour", but as heralds of the more or less immediate advent of the kingdom of God. The mission was thus a failure, and Luke 10. 18 is interpreted as an unfulfilled hope—"I *looked* to see Satan fall as lightning from heaven." The incident was of great importance, for the Lord's recognition of the failure contributed largely to the decisive change in his ministry. Dr Taylor writes (p. 111): "Through the failure of the mission, the fate of John the Baptist, and his own profound meditation upon the Servant teaching of Isa. 53, Jesus was led to seek a deeper interpretation of the doctrine of the Son of Man."

This may be enough to show the character and quality of the book. It would be an impertinence to praise the clear and vigorous terms in which, as always, Dr Taylor presents his views; and, quite apart from his references in the footnotes to his fuller discussions elsewhere, the reader cannot help being impressed with the feeling that for every point he makes Dr Taylor could, if challenged, produce fully documented and cogently argued reasons.

Criticisms of such a work may be of two kinds—criticism of the undertaking as a whole and of the approach to the Gospels it implies, or criticism of this particular attempt to carry out the undertaking. Perhaps a few questions of the latter sort may be raised first.

Some readers may be surprised that such a study should contain so little reference to contemporary Jewish religion. Dr Taylor more than once insists that in such matters as cosmology or belief in demon-possession Jesus shared to the full the outlook of his contemporaries. But the Lord's attitude to contemporary religion, as here portrayed, might almost seem to have been confined to his rejection of popular Messianic expectations and his hostility to the outlook of the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Yet there was, we know, a vigorous and many-sided religious ferment among the Jews of the period, and the two key-concepts of the teaching of Jesus, the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, seem to belong to it rather than to the canonical religion;[2] neither is really an Old Testament idea.[3]

[1] Dr Taylor interprets Mark as meaning that Jesus actually crossed into Gentile territory and that he went alone.

[2] Although the actual term "Kingdom of God" occurs seldom, if ever, in the post-canonical literature.

[3] Of course the former *idea* and the latter *phrase* occur in the Old Testa-

Moreover, as Dr Taylor himself suggests, Jesus shared fully and vividly in the contemporary expectation of the imminence of the end, and a number of passages hint at other points on which he was, religiously, a man of his time. The point is one of some importance because the impression left by Dr Taylor is that, whatever Jesus may have borrowed from his contemporaries in the way of terminology, the substance of his self-understanding was derived from his own experience illuminated by the canonical Scriptures, especially Isaiah 53 (e.g. p. 143). And, as we have seen, between Jesus' self-understanding, thus derived, and the expectations of popular religion the gulf was so wide that it proved unbridgeable. And the growing recognition by our Lord of the existence and width of this gap is the chief clue to the understanding of the development of the ministry and in particular of the concealment of the Messiahship.

This construction has much to commend it, yet it must be pointed out that at every point it is very largely speculative. For example, Dr Taylor himself points out that Isa. 53 is never quoted in Mark or Q but is cited for the first and only time in the Gospels at Luke 22. 37; and it may be added that the Servant Songs as a whole are quoted only four times by the Evangelists, although they cite the O.T. in all something like 400 times.[1] It is probably true, as Dr Taylor argues, that an allusion to Isa. 53 lies behind some Gospel passages which do not expressly quote it, but, as many of these contain allusions as clear, or clearer, to other Old Testament passages as well (cp. e.g. *ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι* at Mark 8. 31 or *ἐξουδενηθῇ* at 9. 12 together with the references given in Hatch and Redpath's Concordance), it will be seen that they do not provide any very strong positive evidence that the Servant Songs were as central to our Lord's mind as Dr Taylor's reconstruction suggests, especially as there is no evidence of the Lord's having referred to himself as the Servant of the Lord or even, according to many scholars, having been so described by the earliest Christians.[2]

The Synoptic Gospels again give little indication of the Lord's having been hailed as Messiah in a wrong sense. On the contrary, in the two passages in Mark where popular estimates of him are enumerated (6. 14 f. and 8. 28) the title Messiah is conspicuous by its absence, and according to Q even the Baptist in prison was uncertain on the matter. When at Caesarea Philippi the disciples are brought to recognize him as the Messiah, this is represented (especially in Matt.,

ment; but attempts to show that the Old Testament provides the immediate background of the New Testament usage have not by any means been wholly convincing.

[1] These figures are taken on a very rough count from the table of O.T. quotations at the end of Westcott and Hort's text. Matt. 8. 17 is no real exception to the statement about Isa. 53 because Isa. 53. 4 is there quoted with reference to the Lord's *healing* activity, not to his interpretation of his destiny and passion; that it could have been so used is perhaps significant. The figures for the way the Servant Songs are used in the N.T. as a whole will also repay study, though this is not the sort of matter that can be settled simply by counting references.

[2] If the idea was as prominent as Dr Taylor suggests, it is odd that Paul says little or nothing explicitly about it.

but also in Mark) as a remarkable and unparalleled insight, to be expected only of disciples.[1] The Synoptic Gospels themselves do not suggest that such was the motive for the Lord's secrecy about the Messiahship and they nowhere depict him as seeking to correct such mistaken notions on the part of the people. On the contrary, at Mark 3. 34 f. approval of the crowd's response seems to be implied, and the rebuke to the disciples at Mark 8. 17 ff. suggests sorrow that men *under*estimated the significance of his miraculous powers. At Mark 14. 62 (Jesus' answer to the High Priest) Dr Taylor prefers the reading "You said that I am", and argues that even here Jesus wished to avoid claiming Messiahship in the popular sense. But if so, it is odd that he immediately went on to apply to himself what must have been a key text of popular Messianism.

It may perhaps be added that, in so far as the idea of a decisive break in the ministry rests on an interpretation of Mark 8. 29 as being a *first* recognition of the Messiahship by the disciples, it too is open to question.[2]

These points are made, not with the aim of rebutting Dr Taylor's account, but of illustrating how very large must be the speculative element even in a sober reconstruction such as this, and so of leading up to the general question of the status, and indeed the possibility, of such attempted reconstructions. On this matter Dr Taylor makes his position quite clear. Christianity is nothing if it is not an historical religion, and therefore in the "wise words" of R. C. Moberly, which he quotes (p. 8), "Councils, we admit, and Creeds cannot go behind, but must wholly rest upon the history of our Lord Jesus Christ." With this few practising Christians will want to disagree; Christian faith is a response to something which actually happened, and if it could be shown that Jesus Christ was not an historical figure, Councils and their Creeds would avail nothing. And not only must we believe that Jesus Christ was an historical figure, we must be able to believe that his life and ministry were such that what is said of them in the Gospels—and indeed in the rest of the New Testament—is, broadly speaking, "fair comment" upon them. And of course, if Jesus Christ was an historical person, then his life must have had a course and development capable of being described like those of any other human life. But—and this is the vital question—*is it necessary for our religious faith that we in* 1956 *should be capable of writing such a description?* Dr Taylor appears to believe that, at any rate to some extent, it is (see the passage quoted at the beginning of this article); but in this he goes beyond the quotation from Moberly, and might almost seem to confuse two questions. For it is one thing to demand that the life on which our religion is based was a genuinely historical life; it is another thing to demand that we should be able to derive from the Gospels an outline account of that life satisfactory to our modern historical standards, methods and curiosity. Yet Dr Taylor is too clear-sighted a man to confuse such

[1] See the illuminating discussion of the passage in R. H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St Mark*, pp. 33–4.

[2] Cp. R. H. Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 33 f.

questions, and perhaps the issues go much deeper, even perhaps to an ultimate theological cleavage, too profound for adequate discussion here.[1] Suffice it to say that there are some who can believe in historic Christianity without necessarily feeling able to write an historical outline of the life of Christ on the basis of the Gospels. Their reasons for being able to do so no doubt vary, but often, perhaps, in this country, they are connected with belief in the Church, in some sense the writer, definer, preserver and expounder of the New Testament.

But this raises a further question, for Dr Taylor clearly feels that the credit of Mark is somehow bound up with the possibility of our deriving such an historical outline from his Gospel. This, however, is to beg a very big question, for it is to assume that Mark set out to provide an historical outline, or at any rate to write a book from which such could be derived. This, as we have already seen, is what Dr Taylor does assume; he makes it abundantly plain, for example, in his criticisms of Dr Farrer and Archbishop Carrington, writing of the latter (p. 32) "the value of the Markan outline is likely to be depreciated if the Gospel has been built on the ground plan of a lectionary". But what Dr Taylor does not prove, nor has anyone else, to the satisfaction of the present writer, is that Mark necessarily *intended* his work to have the particular kind of historical value he desiderates, as contrasted, for example, with the typological or lectionary value suggested by Dr Farrer or the Archbishop. That is to say that for some readers the most serious criticism of Dr Taylor's book will be his failure to raise the question: What manner of writing is a Gospel? and the allied question: Of what character are the connexions between the sections in such a book: historical, typological, liturgical, theological, catechetical? It is true that Mark has chosen to cast his exposition of the Lord into what is on the surface a narrative form, but that does not prejudge the questions just raised, as Dr Taylor himself recognizes in certain cases.

And here an allied question may perhaps be raised about Dr Taylor's use of the word "sceptical". There are two possible grounds for doubting whether an historical outline such as Dr Taylor has essayed can readily be derived from the Gospels. One ground would be that, though the Evangelists set out to provide such, they were too ignorant or prejudiced or dishonest to succeed. The other would be that such an attempt fell outside their interests or purposes. If the word "sceptical" applies to the holders of both views, it surely applies to them in very different senses. It may be repeated that Dr Taylor's book gives little hint of the real depth or significance of the question: What kind of a work is an *evangelion*? Yet we have no analogies, so the answer cannot lightly be assumed.

[1] If so, this cleavage will not be unconnected either with confessional differences or with the desire of the older liberals ("whose greatness", as Dr Taylor rightly says, "needs no bush") to by-pass the dogmas of traditional Christianity and to reconstruct the Gospel events simply by the methods of scientific history. They then hoped that the life and teaching of Jesus, so discovered, would prove a self-evidently reasonable basis for modern religion. Their reconstructions were to provide the sole touchstone of dogmatic formulas. (But it is not of course suggested that Dr Taylor is himself a "liberal" in this sense.)

This omission will loom all the larger for those who feel that it was when this question began to be taken seriously that Gospel study took a great step forward. In the nature of the case, Dr Taylor's book deals largely with Mark's Gospel, and some of his readers, who are more accustomed perhaps to a rather different approach, may be reminded of a work already mentioned in which the late Professor R. H. Lightfoot also sought to expound *The Gospel Message of St Mark*. They will remember how in that book, as in his earlier books, he scrutinized every connexion and articulation in Mark's account, seeking to show what its character was in each case and what theological or edificatory lesson it was designed to convey. Thus the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (8. 22 ff.) came where it did and was told as it was because it had theological illumination to throw on the passage immediately following. Likewise the evangelist placed Bartimaeus where he did because in his story is shown the truth about the Christian's conversion and his "following Jesus in the way"—even to his cross (10. 52 ff.). All this implies an answer to the question: What is a Gospel? which must surely be reckoned with. But let there be no misunderstanding: those who feel more at home with this sort of approach will not for a moment doubt the need and desirability of such an undertaking as Dr Taylor's; rather they will agree with him that such attempts must be made ever and again in every generation. Only they will perhaps not attach to the undertaking such a high *theological* significance as Dr Taylor appears to do; and when such attempts are made they will perhaps tremble a little lest in the effort to derive from the Gospels truths (however important) which, in their view, they were not primarily designed to convey, we should lose some precious drops of that truth which it *was* their first aim to communicate.

D. E. Nineham.

The Baptismal Interrogations

When infants are baptized in the Church of England to-day, we are required by the Prayer Book to put to them certain questions, particularly whether they renounce the devil and whether they believe in God the Holy Trinity. It is in this manner that we give effect to the Church's ancient custom and the teaching of the New Testament that repentance and faith are conditions of baptism. Just as the interrogations of the Creed elicit the faith of the candidate, so the renunciation of the devil is the liturgical expression of his repentance. These questions relating to the renunciation and the Creed have been a part of the Church's baptismal rite for as far back as history takes us; they are found first of all in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus (*c.* 220), where however the renunciation appears in a declaratory form, and were evidently framed in circumstances when baptism of adults was the normative practice. The use of virtually identical questions to-day when infant baptism is the norm is a source of much heart-searching and doubt, both for scrupulous godparents and for the clergy who are accustomed to administer Holy

Baptism. In particular it is questioned whether godparents have the right to make promises in the name of the infants: and though ingenious explanations have been made to justify the practice, yet the common feeling of uneasiness is plainly indicated in the fact that the recent 20th-century revisions have made some hesitant attempts to alter the relevant formulas to make them more acceptable. The theological importance of this passage in the rite lies in the witness it bears to the fact that there exists some connexion between baptism on the one hand and the repentance and faith of the candidate on the other. Its liturgical importance lies in this, that the baptismal interrogations have been the very core of the rite from the time of Hippolytus to the present day: and the interrogations of our present rite, in their unfortunately emasculated form, represent its only link with real antiquity. The survival of this passage in a modern order, in a form which shall be satisfactory both intellectually and liturgically, is therefore a matter of great importance. It is thus the purpose of this article to examine the history of this passage of the baptismal rite, to examine the significance of certain modern proposed alterations, and to make suggestions.

For about a thousand years before the Reformation, during which period infant baptism was normal in many parts of Europe and adult baptism a rarity, the two important questions, in triple form, had commonly been addressed to infant candidates: Dost thou renounce the devil? Dost thou believe in God, etc.? Thus the following form from the Sarum manual hardly differs from the form in Hippolytus:

N. Abrenuncias Satanae? Respondeant compatrini et commatrinae, Abrenuncio.
Et omnibus operibus ejus? Resp. Abrenuncio.
Et omnibus pompis ejus? Resp. Abrenuncio.
N. Credis in Deum Patrem, etc.? Resp. Credo.
Credis et in Jesum Christum, etc.? Resp. Credo.
Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum, etc.? Resp. Credo.

Though the details sometimes varied, this was the universal use of the Western Church: with the exception of a few rare examples of significant variations, which we shall examine later. A ruthlessly logical interpretation of the implications of this passage seems to show that it depends upon the following presuppositions: that the child is capable of, and has experienced, a present faith and a present repentance (for questions and answers are all in the present tense); and that the sole function of the godparent, *at this point of the rite*, is to supply the child's lack of articulate speech. The child is thus treated as a responsible but inarticulate person: the formulas would be suited well to the baptism of a deaf mute. Possibly the Church, in her pastoral ministrations, explained the matter differently, but it seems clear that the foregoing interpretation, extraordinary though it may appear, is fairly warranted by the actual text of the rite.

It is therefore no matter of surprise that Archbishop Cranmer made a significant alteration at this point of the rite. In the books of 1549 and 1552 the questions themselves remained fundamentally the

same. That is to say, they were still addressed to the child, in the present tense, and the godparents still spoke for the child. The innovation lay in the preamble which the minister was required to read before he put the questions. The preamble contained the words "these infants must also faithfully for their part *promise* by you that be their sureties that they *will* forsake, etc." The future tense is introduced, and a profound difference is thus made to the rationale of the passage as compared with the Latin forms above. It embodies the suggestion that faith and repentance cannot be expected of the child at the present moment, but that the Church must have a promise for the future. It introduces also the notion that godparents have the right to make promises in the name of the child, which the child will be duty bound to honour and perform in due course.

Questionable though this notion is now thought to be, it ought to be recognized that the passage which we have just quoted, appearing for the first time in 1549, is an important contribution to liturgical history. Whereas for centuries before the Reformation the Church had been content with the formularies of adult baptism, Archbishop Cranmer evidently made a constructive effort to produce a rite suited to the particular needs of infant baptism. Though the notion of present faith and present repentance is still implicit in the actual interrogations of 1549, and their replies, the notion of future faith and repentance introduces a healthy note of reality. It recognizes that, if faith and repentance are to be regarded as conditions of baptism, they are post-requisites and not pre-requisites.

It is important also to notice that, both in Cranmer's rites and in the Latin rite, the godparents are not themselves personally involved in the matter of renunciation and the creed. It is true of course that they are charged with the spiritual welfare of the child at another point in the rite, and thus laid under a certain obligation. But so far as faith and repentance are concerned, which are the two classic conditions of baptism, it is the child alone who is involved in promises: the godparent at this stage does nothing more than lend the child a tongue.

Between the books of 1552 and 1662 there is only one point of substantial difference in this section of the office, and that is the introduction in 1662 of the phrase "in the name of this child" in the first question only. In view of the subsequent extended use which has been made of this phrase in the 20th-century revisions, it may be useful to take note of the circumstances and purpose of its first introduction. The Puritan Exceptions against the Book of Common Prayer, which were presented in 1661 in view of the impending revision of the Prayer Book, include the following comment upon the baptismal interrogations: "We desire that the two first interrogations be put to the parents to be answered in their own names, and the last propounded to the parents or pro-parents thus, 'Will you have this child baptized into this faith?'" (Cardwell, *Conferences upon the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 324). The bishops' reply (p. 355) reads as follows: "It hath been accounted reasonable, and allowed by the best laws, that guardians should covenant and con-

tract for their minors to benefit. By the same right the Church hath appointed sureties to undertake for children when they enter into covenant with God by baptism. And this general practice of the Church is enough to satisfy those that doubt." It is a reasonable inference that the insertion of the phrase "in the name of this child" into the first interrogation may be read as the direct outcome of this exchange, and that its purpose was to make it perfectly clear that the promises did not involve the godparents, as the Puritans sought, but only the child. Whether in fact the bishops really achieved greater clarity we may well doubt: the recent extended use of the phrase might make us wish that it had never been introduced into the rite: but it seems plain that its original purpose was as we have just stated it—to make doubly clear that at this point of the service the godparents were not involved in any undertaking on their own account. At the end of the service they are charged with the child's spiritual welfare, but at this stage it is not the godparents who promise faith and repentance, but the child.

Before we turn to the revised orders of the 20th century we must examine the two approaches to the baptismal interrogations which this inquiry has so far revealed, the first of which we shall call Cranmer's, and the second the Puritan, approach. It is Cranmer who gave liturgical form to the notion that godparents may make promises for infants which shall be binding upon the infants. This is the notion which the bishops in 1661 confirmed and against which the modern godparent is rebelling: a typical example of the attempt to justify it is found in the Rev. Charles Wheatly's *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer* (*q.v. in loc.*). "The priest addresses himself to the godfathers and godmothers to promise for the infant, and from them takes security that the infant shall observe the conditions which are required of him. And in this there is nothing strange or new: nothing which is not used almost in every contract. . . . [Thus] whenever kings are crowned in their infancy, some of the nobility, deputed to represent them, take the usual oaths. The same do ambassadors for their principals at the ratifying of leagues or articles: and guardians for their minors, who are bound by the law to stand to what is contracted for them. Since then all nations and orders of men act by this method, why should it be charged as a fault upon the Church, that she admits infants to baptism by sponsors undertaking for them?" Arguments of this kind are rather tortuous to the simple godparent. Worse than this, however, the analogy really seems false. Holy Baptism is not a legal contract, nor are the conditions upon which it is administered. We may just be able to imagine that if a guardian were to betroth his infant ward to some other infant with an equally obliging guardian, then the two infants might be legally obliged, upon their maturity, to complete the marriage contract: but we cannot imagine that they would be under any obligation to fall in love with each other! In the same way, repentance and faith are not duties which can be discharged in the impersonal manner of the lawyer: they make demands upon the whole human personality, with all its affections and

emotions. It is of course always true that every human being owes to his Creator the duties of faith and repentance, but it does not seem that these duties can be exacted by human agency, nor secured by legal process: and for that reason we may conclude that they ought not to be guaranteed in advance by legal process either.

Dr D. S. Bailey, in his *Sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation* (S.P.C.K., 1953), which contains a great deal of material relevant to the present inquiry, quotes patristic and medieval attempts to justify this practice, notably that of St Augustine in his 98th Epistle to Boniface (op. cit., pp. 107 ff.), and suggests, in a rather hesitant expression, that they were "not unsuccessful" (p. 127). But whether the arguments were successful from the point of view of logic and theology or not, it is a fact that they are so complicated and difficult that few parish priests would care to expound them to intending godparents.

The Puritan approach to the interrogations requires that the *godparents* should be invited to renounce the devil and to confess the Christian faith *on their own account*. The bishops rejected this, and rightly: but since the Puritan approach appears to have been embodied in most of the revised orders of the 20th century, it is important to observe its faults. There is no objection, of course, to the godparent renouncing the devil and confessing the Christian faith: it is an edifying thing to do, and he should in any case have been regularly engaged in doing it, at least since his confirmation. Moreover, it may rightly be said that the pastoral necessities of the present day demand that we should have such an undertaking from the godparent in his own name. The fault of the Puritan proposal lies not in what it tacitly affirmed but in what by implication it disregarded. It ignores the fact that the rite is concerned for the *child*, and for the child's repentance and faith, and that the repentance and faith of the godparent is simply beside the point. While of course it is true that we look for these things in our godparents, the fact is that from the earliest antiquity this passage of the rite has borne witness to the necessity of the faith and repentance of the candidate himself. No substitute will do. A profession from the godparent on his own account is pointless: the entire excision of the interrogations (which I do not advocate) would be better than a Puritan revision which would evacuate them of all point and significance.

We may now examine the baptismal interrogations as they appear in the 20th-century revisions of the service. Four proposed orders confront us: they are, first, the order as proposed in 1928; secondly, that put out by York Convocation in 1951 (York); thirdly, that submitted to Canterbury Convocation in 1954 in a majority report of a committee (Major); and, fourthly, the order proposed by a minority of the same committee (Minor). Though York is out of print, it is virtually identical with Major, and both Major and Minor are available in the committee's report published under the title *Baptism and Confirmation To-day* (S.P.C.K., 1955).

We address ourselves first to Major and Minor. The circumstances of the making of these two rites are shown in the majority report,

which records the democratic measures taken to canvass clerical opinion upon pastoral and liturgical aspects of Holy Baptism by questions submitted to ruridecanal chapters. One of the questions, under the heading *Promises and Vows,* runs as follows:

"Do you consider the best course to be that godparents should take the vows:

(a) *on behalf of the child;*
(b) *for themselves only; or*
(c) *both on behalf of the child and for themselves also?"*

Since the question presumably reveals something of the mind of its progenitors it deserves our examination.

(1) It is not unreasonably pedantic to point out that "on behalf of" does not necessarily mean the same as "in the name of". If we perform an action on behalf of someone else, then we do it *either* for their benefit, but without necessarily involving them, *or* in their name, as representing them, and thus involving them. It does not seem likely that the people who framed this question appreciated the distinction which can be made between these two expressions, for if they had done so they would have realized that parts (*a*) and (*b*) may possibly mean the same thing. But when we pass on to the proposed new rites themselves, and find that each of them uses *both* expressions within a few seconds of each other, we shall realize that it is impossible to know with confidence just what the rite does mean.

(2) Over the second suggestion, that the godparents should take the vows for themselves only, we need spend no more time: it is the Puritan approach, 300 years old.

The crucial passage of York and the Major rite runs as follows:

". . . it is your solemn duty as godparents to make the threefold promise on behalf of this child.

Do you, in the name of this child, renounce all that is evil, etc.?

Answer: I do."

The Minor rite has a relevant passage in its introduction, which includes the following sentence: *"Know then that herein by the washing of regeneration in response to your prayers and to renunciation of evil and your confession of faith in Jesus Christ on behalf of this child he will be made a member of Christ, etc."* Later in the order we read:

"Brethren, . . . it is your part to make on his behalf, first a solemn renunciation of all evil, and then a solemn confession of your faith in God and in his holy Church.

Then turning to the child, he shall say:

Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works?

Answer: I renounce them."

It would be difficult to make any confident statement about the meaning of either of these quotations without fear of contradiction. Some details suggest that they seek to express Cranmer's approach, others that they have adopted the Puritan. Possibly both are intended: we cannot say. But it is extremely unfortunate if we are to be asked, or even permitted, to use orders of which the meaning is so

far from clear. It is perhaps inevitable that the *language* of a baptismal rite must be difficult for the uneducated: but it is of importance that its *action* should be clear and unmistakable: it is with the action of the rite that we are here concerned, and it is very far from clear what the action is. Do the infants make confessions of present faith and repentance? Do the godparents make promises, binding upon the children, of future faith and repentance? Or do the godparents simply confess their own faith and repentance? There are phrases in each of these rites which suggest all three alternatives, and it is quite impossible to say whether in fact they teach any one or all of them.

Whatever these rites are supposed to mean, we have already seen cause to believe that not one of the three alternatives which we have just listed is satisfactory. It seems a pity that when the Church is evidently ready to take radical steps to revise the baptismal rite, these steps should not be accompanied by more radical thought about the conditions upon which it is prepared to administer baptism to infants, and their liturgical expression. Surely it is plain that the repentance and faith of the child can be nothing more than a hope for the future. The godparent is in a position to promise that he will teach the child to say his prayers, to take him to church, to surround him with love and Christian influences—but he can guarantee nothing else. The only conditions which we can positively secure before we baptize an infant are that his godparents will do just this. If in addition to this we think it desirable to make the godparent renew his own vows of faith and repentance, yet it is most undesirable that we should do it through the formularies which anciently belonged to the candidate's expression of his own faith and repentance. These formularies ought to be reserved for an expression of the connexion which still exists between the classic conditions of baptism and the candidate himself, infant though he may be. A fourth, more logical, alternative still exists, and we shall shortly look at it.

The time has come to redeem an earlier promise and to examine some more ancient evidence of dissatisfaction with, and revision of, this passage of the baptismal rite. The first comes from Africa. Our knowledge of the African liturgy is confined to what can be gleaned from patristic writings, and the following quotation from St Augustine (Epistle 98) is of interest: ". . . which is what parents do when, in presenting their children for baptism, they as sureties (or sponsors) answer for the children, and say that they do that which at their age they are incapable even of understanding. . . . For we ask those by whom the child is presented, Does he believe in God? and although at that age the child does not so much as know that there is a God, the sponsors reply, He believes: and in like manner answer is returned by them to each of the other questions of the persons administering baptism." The interest of this passage lies in the evidence it supplies that the African rite, instead of absurdly addressing its questions to a child who did not hear them, addressed them to the sponsors. It thus avoided some of the unreality which is involved in

the dialogue of both ancient and modern rites. It is also of interest as an early and rare example of an attempt to frame the baptismal rite in terms suited to the particular requirements of infant baptism. But it is not otherwise very much to our point, as it makes no attempt to solve the particular difficulties with which we are here concerned.

The *Missale Gothicum* is a French Sacramentary of about 700 A.D. (published by the Henry Bradshaw Society, Vols. 52 and 54). It is clear from the opening collect of the baptismal office in this book that it represents a desire to adapt the adult rite to the needs of infants. The collect runs: "O Lord, condescend to bless this child, thy servant N. forasmuch as neither his estate nor age doth prevent it: according as Thy most dearly beloved Son, Our Lord, hath said, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not. Let these Thy children, Lord, before they know good or evil, be signed with the sign of Thy Cross, and may they in this their infancy be counted worthy to receive the baptism of Thy Holy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord." When we come to look at the interrogations, all we find is the following:

> *Dum baptizas, interrogas ei et dicis*
> *Baptizo te illum in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti in remissionem peccatorum ut habeas vitam aeternam amen.*

The words *interrogas ei* have been interpreted as a reference to the interrogations respecting faith and renunciation which commonly appear in other rites. Thus, the Rev. T. Thompson (*The Offices of Baptism and Confirmation*, p. 153) comments: "According to the rubric, the interrogations are put during baptism; this is a trace of the old custom of interrogating the candidate in the water." There are certain indications, however, that a different interpretation of the rubric is equally possible. It might refer simply to the customary and necessary question, "*Quis dicitur ille?*" It is hard to imagine that the important questions about faith and repentance, for which varying formulas seem to have been employed in Gaul alone, should thus briefly and casually be covered in the words *interrogas ei*. It is true that upon a strict translation of *interrogas ei*, the questions are to be addressed to the child, whereas *Quis dicitur ille?* is not: and this supports Mr Thompson's interpretation. On the other hand, if we take into account the looseness of medieval Latin in general, and of Missale Gothicum in particular, we need have no difficulty in supposing that the rubric refers simply to the question put to the godparents asking the child's name, a necessary question to which no other reference is made. When we recall the collect quoted above, and infer the evident intention of framing a rite suited to infant baptism (which the current Latin rite was not), we may readily suppose that the intention of this rite is simply and deliberately to omit the ancient questions of faith and repentance, and in this radical manner to solve the problems which the common Latin forms presented.

Our last and most interesting document is the Bobbio Missal

(Henry Bradshaw Society, Vols, 53, 58, 61; also Migne, P.L. 72). This is another Gallican sacramentary, of approximately the same date as the *Missale Gothicum*. The baptismal interrogations in this book are so interesting and so peculiar that we must see their full text:

INTERROGAS NOMEN EIUS DICENS QUIS DICITUR ILLE
Abrenuncias Satane pompis eius luxuriis suis saeculo huic
RESPONDET ABRENUNCIIT hoc ter dices
Interrogas nomen eius QUIS DICITUR ille.
Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, etc.
RESPONDET CREDAT.
Credit in Iesu Christo filium eius, etc.
RESPONDET CREDAT.
Credit in sancto spiritu, etc.
RESPONDET CREDAT.

There is of course no such word as *renunciit*. The edition of the Missal in Migne therefore prints *renunciat*, conforming it to current use. Nevertheless, an examination of the Henry Bradshaw Society's fascimile edition shows quite plainly that the correct reading of the MS. is *renunciit*. It shows also that the unexpected subjunctive *credat* is undoubtedly the correct reading in the replies to the three credal questions. Now, the normal and traditional formulas of the Latin West used the words *abrenuncio* (I renounce) and *credo* (I believe), both in the indicative mood. It would therefore be simple to suppose that an ignorant scribe has made a mistake, and that he should have written *abrenunciat* (he renounces) and *credit* (he believes). But it would be just as simple, and if we may say so more scholarly, to say that when the scribe wrote *credat* three times, he meant it, and similarly that when he wrote *renunciit* he wrote it in mistake not for *renunciat* but for *renunciet*. In fact, if we are correct, the Bobbio Missal offers a new reply to the ancient interrogations. "Let him renounce", "Let us hope (or pray) he will believe", "Let us hope he will believe". This involves nobody in any rash or untrue statements, nor in any promises of doubtful validity. It recognizes that, since there can be no certain guarantee of faith and repentance, we must be content with the hope and prayer that faith and repentance will one day be forthcoming. The Bobbio Missal is a peculiar and enigmatic document: but here, we venture to suggest, it sheds the light of logic and pure reason upon a difficult problem, and produces the perfect solution. In the English language we cannot accomplish such effective changes by the simple alteration of a single letter, but Bobbio seems to set us an example in its approach to the matter by which we may very well profit.

This review of the baptismal interrogations as they are framed in a number of English and Latin rites makes clear to us the true nature of the difficulty and embarrassment both of the godparents and clergy to-day when they are confronted by the questions and answers provided by the Prayer Book. Repentance and faith are the natural and proper conditions upon which the Church administers baptism to adults: the real problem is whether these same conditions apply to

infant baptism, and if so in what way. We have seen the unreality of the Roman rite, which requires a confession of the infant's present faith and present repentance: we have seen cause to doubt the propriety of the English rite, whereby promises of doubtful value are extracted from infants: we have looked at the English 20th-century revisions, where the interrogations are made tolerable only at the cost of robbing them of their point and significance. Yet all these formulas, unsatisfactory though they are in their varying ways, bear witness to the Church's unchanging belief that faith and repentance have to do with baptism, whether the candidate is adult or infant. The fact surely is that faith and repentance are, or ought to be, the particular marks and characteristics of the baptized person, and it is therefore right and proper that the Church should seek to express this connexion in the baptismal rite. For this reason we should deplore the negative action of *Missale Gothicum*, which if we have correctly understood it has cut out all references to faith and repentance: for the same reason we approve the Bobbio Missal, which recognizes the connexion, which does not ask for any impossible confession or promise, and yet makes the least possible change to the actual liturgical formulas.

We may go further than saying merely that there is a connexion between faith and repentance on the one hand and baptism on the other. The connexion between them in adult baptism is that one is the condition of the other: but in infant baptism, faith and repentance can be nothing more than a hope for the future. Let us be bold enough to acknowledge that it is impossible to exact them as conditions, either as pre-requisite conditions guaranteed in advance, or as post-requisite conditions promised for the future. If any conditions at all are demanded in infant baptism, they can only be that the godparents will bring up the child in a Christian manner. This is in fact the only condition that we can exact. A gratuitous affirmation of the godparents' faith and repentance though doubtless edifying is of no significant importance: it is the faith and repentance of the infant which we may seek, for which there can be no substitute, and of which we can have no certainty. The best we can do is to follow the Bobbio Missal, and express our faith and hope and prayer that the child will grow into these things; in fact, that he will grow into his baptism. And if, like Bobbio, we can do this with the least possible disturbance to classical formulas, so much the better.[1]

E. C. Whitaker.

[1] Another interesting variation of the interrogations appears in two MSS of the Spanish *Liber Ordinum* (*c.* 1050), which both read, in brief, as follows: "Abrenuntiat hic famulus Dei diabolo, etc.? *R.* Abrenuntiat. Credis in Deum Patrem, etc.? *R.* Credet. Et ego baptizo eum in nomine, etc., ut habeat vitam eternam."

Preaching Class Canons

[The following canons, for the use of men taking part in preaching classes, were drawn up by Dr J. B. Paton and are still used at Paton Congregational College, Nottingham. We are grateful to the present Principal of the College for allowing us to publish them. In Scott Holland's *A Bundle of Memories* there is a passage about Paton which begins thus: "The most lovable of the great Nonconformist Leaders was Dr J. B. Paton. There was nobody like him. He had the fire of the prophet and the heart of a child."—Ed. THEOLOGY.]

Exegesis

1. Was the text correctly read?
2. Did the sermon show that the preacher understood the context?
3. Did the sermon come naturally out of the passage from which the text was taken?
4. Were the passages of Scripture quoted in the sermon rightly used?

Plan

1. Had the sermon an intelligible form?
2. Was the introduction calculated to arouse interest?
3. Was there logical cohesion of effect in the conclusion?
4. Was there proper culmination of effect in the conclusion?
5. Can you suggest a better conclusion?

Composition

1. Was the grammar correct?
2. Were the sentences judiciously mixed?
3. Did any sentence end with a preposition? If so, was it justifiable?
4. Were the interrogations reasonably abundant, and judiciously used?
5. Were the figures of speech, especially the similes and metaphors, appropriate and well expressed?
6. Were the paragraphs well built and clearly marked?

Words and Phrases

1. Were the words used too elaborate or too simple?
2. Were the words rightly pronounced?
3. Were the words so spoken as to bring out the essential meaning in the positive word?
4. Did each syllable have its proper weight?
5. Were all the vowels properly sounded?
6. Were the final consonants duly brought out?

Delivery

1. Was the delivery too rapid or too slow?
2. Was the delivery monotonous?
3. Did the preacher stand firmly and easily?

General Estimate

1. Was the subject suitable for treatment in the pulpit?
2. What classes of persons are most likely to benefit by considering the subject?
3. In the treatment of the subject was there any object obviously and continually kept in view?
4. If so, was the preacher likely to accomplish the object in view?
5. Did the preacher show a real knowledge of human nature, and a sympathy with it?
6. Did he press home the truth wisely and affectionately?

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Chavasse has been Bishop of Rochester since 1940.

The Rev. D. E. Nineham is Professor of Biblical and Historical Theology at King's College, London.

The Rev. E. C. Whitaker is Vicar of Kirkby Ireleth in the diocese of Carlisle.

CORRESPONDENCE

CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The judgment of Père Bouyer on the Church of South India will cause no surprise to those who have kept themselves informed of developments there. Perhaps the most striking thing in his article is the observation that while during the course of reunion negotiations the Anglicans constantly lost ground—a fact that comes out most movingly in Bengt Sundkler's history—yet since 1947 the Anglican and Catholic element has played a leading part in determining the ethos of the united Church. This fact is worthy of very serious consideration by Anglicans. In the light of subsequent history it may seem that the Lambeth Conference of 1948 was altogether too curt in closing the door for the future on schemes of reunion based on the South India pattern. We may well ask whether it was a wise decision to reject the device of an interim period and to insist on the immediate unification of the ministry as a condition of reunion. The methods of uniting the ministry so far suggested have been fraught with theological difficulties as grave as, and practical difficulties graver than, those involved in the acceptance of an interim period. The situation in such a period, while anomalous, does not appear to be inconsistent with classical Anglican theology. The scale of priorities is surely that it is more important that a Church should possess and honour apostolic bishops than that its ministers should receive ordination at their hands—though, of course, we should expect ordination normally to be by episcopal laying on of hands,

as indeed will eventually be the case in South India. Would it not be possible when considering other schemes of reunion involving Anglicans at any rate to pay greater respect to the one successful scheme so far on record?

Yours sincerely,
JOHN T. MARTIN.

ANNANDALE,
NORTH END ROAD,
LONDON, N.W.11.
9 *January* 1956.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE TEACHERS' COMMENTARY. Seventh Edition (completely revised, enlarged and reset). Edited by G. Henton Davies and Alan Richardson. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE SHORTER OXFORD BIBLE. By William J. Shergold. Independent Press. 12s. 6d.

This revised edition of *The Teachers' Commentary* has already been welcomed by teachers who have valued former editions. I cannot review it from any personal experience of the professional needs of day school teachers. But the editors "hope that many besides those who actually teach in day schools and Sunday schools all over the world will find in the present book a convenient and useful one-volume commentary on the Bible which meets all their needs, spiritual, devotional and intellectual", and it is with the general reader most in mind that I have looked through the volume with interest. For an increasing number of lay people are looking for the kind of help in their use of the Bible which the editors claim to provide.

The volume has many excellent features—concise introductory articles by such scholars as G. Ernest Wright, H. H. Rowley, T. H. Robinson, H. W. Robinson, and C. H. Dodd; readable print; useful bibliographies; maps; and a chronological scheme of dates. N. H. Snaith (Psalms and Minor Prophets), C. R. North (Isaiah), E. W. Heaton (Daniel), and K. Grayston (Pauline Epistles) are some of those who have contributed introductions and notes on the text, and there is a great deal of concise, illuminating, and helpful comment. But some of the questions in the mind of the intelligent general reader approaching the Bible seriously for the first time are not recognized and answered. Nothing is said about the accounts of the fall of Jericho or the ascension of Elijah. No comment is made on the miracles in 2 Kings 1–6, except that in his introductory article on "Miracles" Professor Richardson writes: "The group of miracles associated with Elijah and Elisha . . . may perhaps best be understood as the kind of legendary tales of wonders which accumulate around famous men, and are tributes to the impressiveness of the personalities of the two prophets rather than eye-witness accounts of their doings." The article on "The Religion of Israel" says nothing about sacrifice, which is cursorily mentioned in only a single paragraph of the article on "The Theology of the Old Testament." There is no explanation of the terms Old Testament and New Testament,

and "testament" does not appear in the index. Nothing is said about the nature of prophecy.

The contributors have often failed to keep the "general reader" (and even the ordinary teacher?) in mind in their use of language. "Charismatic", "amphictyonic", "eschatology", "archetypal", "the remnant", and "Sitz im Leben" are each introduced without explanation. Pages 105 and 129 are so full of jargon as to be largely unintelligible. The note on Exodus 29. 46 is "Self-predication issuing in the redemption from Egypt, just as God's dwelling with his people is within the divine self-predication" (p. 141). The editors apparently do not realize that even such words as "grace" and "faith" must be explained, even to most teachers, I suspect. There is no adequate explanation of either. The index does not help. It is unimaginatively constructed and printed. Casual references to words are all listed, and there is no indication where an explanation can be found. The only reference to "charity" is to a comment applying the word to Luke 14. 12–14!

The book would be easier to use if variation in the type discriminated between notes on minor matters necessary for understanding of the texts and those on matters of major importance. This would, I suspect, reveal what wide variations there are in different parts of the commentary in the amount of exposition of the spiritual and devotional meaning of the text. Still more of this is needed if the Bible is to bear its witness to reader and teacher and child.

The book is unlikely to contribute anything to the solution of the educational problem exposed in a report compiled by the University of Leeds Institute of Education and presented to the Institute of Christian Education in 1951, summarized in chapter 8 of *Religious Education in Schools* (S.P.C.K., 1954) under the title "Retention of Religious Knowledge". This was the report of an inquiry into the results of school religious instruction among boys and girls aged 16–19. It revealed, what any youth chaplain knows, that "words which they had often heard used at school had no meaning for them", and suggested that "the wealth of material in the agreed syllabuses probably leads to confusion and lack of depth in teaching", and that "fundamental facts of religion are missed by many modern school children"—and, I would add, many grammar school children—"because either the syllabus and teaching are too academic, or the methods are too 'practical' ". A teachers' commentary should at least be aware of and help to remind teachers of these things?

A Devotional Commentary consists of the expository notes on "The Shorter Oxford Bible" written by Dr Shergold for lay preachers of the Congregational Union. I hope that it will be brought to the notice of many lay people as a very useful help to understanding the Bible as a whole and all the most important passages. Dr Shergold makes no parade of his scholarship, and he writes lucidly and with spiritual insight. Only rarely does he slip into sentimental expressions and fancies, as when Jairus' daughter is said to have "walked away with the elastic grace of healthy womanhood". His exposition of the miracle at Cana and his treatment of Genesis 1–3

and of Ecclesiastes are inadequate. But a great merit of the book is the way in which throughout Dr Shergold elucidates the Old Testament in the light of the New, and frequently suggests briefly an application of the passage in our present situation. The book is attractively printed and is unencumbered with footnotes or appendices.

I still look forward to seeing the merits of Dr Shergold's book and of *The Teachers' Commentary* combined.

BRISTOL. R. R. ACHESON.

ST MATTHEW AND ST MARK. By Austin Farrer. Dacre Press. 25s.
MARK'S WITNESS TO CHRIST. By Eduard Lohse. World Christian Books. No. 3. 2s.

Dr Farrer tells us in the first chapter of his book that despite the title, which he uses as being manageable, a true description of his work would be: "The pattern of St Mark's Gospel, and of St Matthew's in so far as it throws light on St Mark's, with a few hints from St Luke's." This new work therefore is largely a review and sometimes a rewriting of *A Study in St Mark* published in 1951. The author claims to have discovered the grand mistake which vitiated his former interpretation of St Mark and to have found in St Matthew new light on the arrangement of St Mark. The volume concludes with two appendices of "retractations".

Dr Farrer does not find his grand mistake in his whole conception of Mark's method of writing, as perhaps some of his critics would like him to. On the contrary he is as sure as ever that there is a "master symbolism unifying the narrative basis of the Gospel". However, he does make clearer his own attitude to "prefiguration". In the former work we were sometimes led to think that Dr Farrer himself held that God "put a pattern in history" and that Mark by an inspired playing about with numbers and a significant ordering of his materials merely made the pattern stand out. Now we are told quite clearly: "We [moderns] might be willing to acknowledge a spiritual identity between present and future things and therefore a prefiguration of the future in the present. We should not admit that resurrection was any more prefigured in the raising of a bedridden person to his feet than in the cure of ulcerous sores. In this respect it really does seem plain that the Evangelists and their whole generation part company from us." If by "a spiritual identity between present and future" is meant that in the spiritual realm a certain line of behaviour leads to the same result whether in past, present, or future, then, if we believe in an unchanging God ruling the world, we scarcely can do less than agree.

Dr Farrer finds his "grand mistake" in his former misunderstanding of the cyclic structure of the Gospel. He is still convinced that Mark wrote his gospel in a pattern, but formerly he saw the pattern wrong. The pattern of healing miracles, the pattern of loaves, the pattern of apostles, are all there, but they were before wrongly grouped. In particular the healing miracles are not really to be seen in "steadily

diminishing blocks each with its annexe" but in "two handfuls (of five) with two over". Support for this patterning in Mark is found in the fact that, despite his own new pattern and extra material, Matthew has respect enough for Mark's patterning to adapt it to fit in with his own. For instance, it is true that fifteen Israelites are healed in Matthew whereas only twelve are healed in Mark, but if we count the healing *acts* in Matthew there are still only twelve, for on three occasions pairs of persons are healed. Again Luke appears deliberately to have doubled the number of persons healed, and in his gospel we can count twenty-four Israelites healed.

In this way (rather than by any thorough demonstration that Mark's contemporaries must have expected this sort of writing) Dr Farrer seems to have made out a case for Mark's adoption of a numeric symbolism, which was clear to other writers of his time and so cannot easily be swept aside as a figment of Dr Farrer's imagination. But perhaps his weightiest piece of evidence lies in Mark's own apparent drawing of attention to numbers in our Lord's conversation with the disciples after the two feedings: "When I broke the five loaves among the five thousand, how many creels full of broken pieces took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve. And when the seven among the four thousand, how many baskets full of broken pieces took ye up? They say unto him, Seven. And he said unto them, Do ye not yet understand?" Here is a riddle indeed, and Dr Farrer admits that his own handling of it may make Mark's meaning more complicated than Mark himself intended. But he is sure that he is on firm ground when he says that the answer to the riddle has something to do with "the extension of the children's bread to the Gentiles", and after reading his exposition it is hard not to agree.

Another change in this volume from the *Study in St Mark* is in Dr Farrer's attitude to the ending of the gospel. He now suggests that after the words "for they were afraid", Mark might originally have written some such words as: "But the name of Jesus became manifest in all the world." Such a short sentence might have been omitted equally naturally by Matthew, Luke and the authors of the spurious conclusions. This suggestion is backed up by the argument that the Resurrection is prefigured in Mark by the anointing at Bethany, and that episode closes with the promise that the woman's act shall, with the gospel, become manifest in all the world.

Whatever the ultimate verdict is on Dr Farrer's beliefs about St Mark's method of writing, such suggestions as these demand very serious consideration. One other suggested prefigurement is equally attractive. Our Lord's warning, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house cometh . . ." (13. 35), aims at the future when the Advent will impend, but is also applicable, and applicable in detail, to the behaviour of the disciples on the eve of Good Friday (pp. 104 f.).

Dr Lohse is evidently among those who, according to Dr Farrer, when asked, "How did Mark think his way through the matter he has recorded for us?" would protest that "Mark did not think at all in any important sense". This writer holds fast to "critical ortho-

doxy", particularly if that phrase may here be taken to mean "as much orthodoxy as is at all consistent with modern criticism". The findings of form criticism are reconciled with Papias. The parables of the kingdom are explained in terms of "realized eschatology". And all this is as it should be, for these booklets are designed to help preachers and teachers of the "younger Churches", who need to understand their faith rather than to run the danger of becoming confused about it. But, this being so, the author seems to glide over some difficulties rather too easily, e.g. the exact connexion between the term "Son of Man" and the conception of a suffering Messiah and the real nature of the Messianic secret. Again, is not to say of the abomination of desolation, "this is a reference in hidden terms to the anti-Christ", a case of *ignotum per ignotius*?

Selwyn College, Cambridge. E. L. Randall.

Early Fathers from the Philokalia. Translated by E. Kadloubovsky and G. E. M. Palmer. Faber and Faber. 35s.

The Western Fathers. Translated and edited by F. R. Hoare. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

These two volumes of translations represent a great contrast in subject matter. It would be going too far to say that they represent an essential contrast between Eastern and Western Christianity, but in the one we have the Greek texts from the *Philokalia* which spring from the moral struggles of the individual ascetic and from his training in Christianity, and in the other the biographies of "Makers of Christendom", from whose lives moral struggles and ascetic propensities were by no means lacking, but whose activities were exercised in wide fields of history. The "Early Fathers" from the *Philokalia* occupy but little space in histories of Christian literature; a few pages of e.g. Altaner's *Patrologie* suffice for them: it is far otherwise with several at any rate of the subjects of Mr Hoare's book.

It may not be out of place to recall that the *Philokalia* is a collection of writings of the Greek Fathers from the time of Constantine onwards, first published at Venice in 1782 (by a slip the book under review says 1792), and translated into Russian in the nineteenth century by Bishop Theophan the Recluse. An earlier volume of selections, by the same translators, was published in 1951 and reviewed in Theology for April 1952. Like the earlier volume the present one is a translation from the Russian text, and we have to remember that *at best* we have before us the translation of a translation: in the case of a Syriac author like Isaac of Nineveh, we are even further removed from the original. The translators point out that the Russian version "was considerably longer than the original" (p. 11), and (in the preface to their earlier volume) that "the Russian text has a value of its own, justifying translation into English, owing to the spiritual understanding of Theophan and of the period in which he lived". Hence, e.g., they continue their use of the word

"prelest", which does not merely represent the Greek πλάνη but "the state of the soul which wanders away from truth" (p. 17). The present reviewer can make no pronouncement on the accuracy of the translation from the Russian, but comparison of a number of passages with the original Greek did not reveal serious divergencies. The authors translated range in date from the 3rd to the 7th centuries, with a few additions from St Gregory Palamas (14th century), and passages apparently written by the original compilers of the *Philokalia*. The translators modestly disclaim any pretensions to scholarship on questions of dates and authorship. They give biographical notices from the Russian where these are available, but with these the reader will be left under various misapprehensions, e.g. Nilus is probably of Ancyra and not of Sinai; a phrase like "Jeronomius, quoted in Patrologia" is easily understandable but looks odd. And words like "Hagiorite", "staretz" and "scete" (*sic*) require explanation. The reviewer in THEOLOGY of the earlier volume concluded with the words: "This book will make many of the treasures of Eastern Orthodoxy more accessible to Western readers and is greatly to be welcomed." One cannot do better than repeat that now about this second volume.

The "treasures" of the *Philokalia* have little to say about the organized Church, about the State and about heresies. It is far otherwise with *The Western Fathers*, which contains the lives of five saints: Martin, Ambrose, Augustine, Honoratus and Germanus. In general, the subjects are more important than the authors, except perhaps for Sulpicius Severus, and the style of the authors ranges from the rhetorical artificialities of Sulpicius and of Hilary of Arles to the "undistinguished Latinity" of Paulinus and Possidius. The aim of the series "Makers of Christendom", of which this book is a part, is "largely to enable the twentieth-century reader to see these makers as far as possible as their contemporaries saw them" (p. ix). Mr Hoare also modestly disclaims any pretence to great learning, and indicates briefly the kind of authorities that he has consulted. The translations are prefaced by a general introduction which sketches (1) the position of the Church—not without occasional overstatement ("There [at Nicaea] she emerged from the catacombs", p. x) and overdogmatism e.g. on the Roman Primacy (p. xvii), (2) the Monastic Movement, and (3) the Cultus and Lives of the Saints. Each section of the work has also a brief introduction and the translations have explanatory footnotes. The reader of these lives is transported into a world of miracles and demons. Mr Hoare is, as he ought to be, on guard against the hagiographical tendencies of his authors, particularly of Sulpicius, whose works on Martin occupy about half the volume, but in general he does not "pull these biographies to pieces". The translations themselves, while not impeccable, are generally accurate and readable, and will do good service in showing readers how monasticism spread in the West and how Church and State reacted on one another. It is, however, disappointing in a translator to find criticism, albeit gentle criticism, of an earlier editor of Paulinus, whose "preoccupation with the grammar

and syntax of fifth-century Latin makes her commentary less helpful than it might otherwise have been" (p. 147). That kind of help is surely to be appreciated, and would, if it had elsewhere been available, have helped Mr Hoare over difficulties that he mentions on p. 247. The notes are generally helpful in explaining the text, but they are too brief to do justice to many of the problems on which they touch, and they are occasionally marred by a lack of precision about matters which could easily have been verified.

Downing College, Cambridge. J. Stevenson.

Ultimate Questions. By Nathaniel Micklem. Geoffrey Bles. 7s. 6d.

The regular appearance of small books like Dr Micklem's ought to bring up serious discussion of some of the basic problems of Christian apologetic. That these little books succeed one another so rapidly shows at least the fact of a demand. But what is the public for these books? Clergy and devoted laymen are no doubt always looking for new ways of saying the old things and for small volumes which they can place in the hands of inquirers. A profitable study might be the comparison of a number of these books for the purpose of discovering just what this imagined inquirer looks like.

In Dr Micklem's view he possesses several obvious characteristics. He is more than reasonably educated and will be able to cope with subtleties like Tillich's distinction between the "technical" and the "ecstatic" reason, a fundamental feature of the argument of this book. He is dissatisfied with what he hears from the average pulpit, dismayed by theological dogmatism, uncertain about the point of theology, respectful (but not uncritically so) of the methods of the sciences, and not at all unwilling to come to some kind of terms with Christianity. Clearly he is not a lowbrow or a typical man-in-the-street; but then this book, like many others of its type, was originally designed as lectures for university audiences.

In five brief chapters *Ultimate Questions* deals with many of the problems which bother this inquirer. In the first, "The Language of Religion", he is told that it is a bad mistake to confuse religious language with the language we use in straightforward factual communication. It is more like poetry and is "symbolic". (But in the Introduction the author confesses, "The distinction between truths of science and 'symbolic' truth is, as I have come to see, less clear in the writings of modern philosophic scientists than I have suggested in these lectures." Indeed it is!)

In Chapter 2, "Creation and Providence", there is a provocative attempt to expound two Christian doctrines which might provide a bridge over which the inquirer could pass to the central Christian beliefs. It is an attempt to show the reasonableness of entertaining the idea of God, and not by means of the conventional arguments for God's existence. In the course of this the inquirer is introduced to the concept of revelation, and the author keeps as close as he can to what everybody already knows about the human desire to find

meaning in individual experience and in history. The final three chapters, "The Jesus of History", "The Resurrection", and "The Cosmic Christ", deal with Incarnation and Atonement in as simple, yet not over-simplified, a way as the space allows. There is only the briefest discussion of the Holy Spirit and almost none of the Church.

How will the inquirer take all of this? He is bound to be impressed by Dr Micklem's candour, his confessions of perplexity and his admirable writing. If he doesn't know it already, he may be relieved to find that Christian theologians do not claim to have final answers to all conceivable questions. He will certainly read on beyond the first page because Dr Micklem tells him that appropriate subtitles for the book might have been "The last thoughts of a discontented theologian" or "The regrettable bankruptcy of traditional theology". The author's delightful and most genial Independency will carry him with great pleasure through the first two chapters. They breathe an air of freedom which he may not associate with theology, and they begin where he is and not where the theologian would like him to be. Important passages in this part of the book remind one of things said by Dietrich Bonhoeffer and even of some of the protests of Simone Weil.

This is all excellent; or so many of us whose business is theology may understandably feel. ("This is just the book for John, who reads Natural Sciences, or for James, who reads English.") It may be, at any rate for a start; and after all that is all we can rightly ask. But if our inquirer has dabbled more extensively in unbelief he can offer serious criticisms of the "poetic truth" idea, the accounts of causality, the interpretations of miracle, the explanation of Atonement or any number of other things. There may be other little books, like those of Professor Hodges and Canon Milford, to which we can send him. (There are certainly many from which we can try to keep him away.) All depends on whether our inquirer plays the expected card, even perhaps on whether we already know what cards he holds. I wonder if we do. Dr Micklem is undoubtedly correct in saying that contemporary obstacles to Christian faith lie much further back than did those of fifty years ago. The trouble is that they keep receding so quickly that, for the theologian, they reach almost the vanishing point. Dr Micklem takes us well behind the older rationalists and evolutionists, the Mrs Knights and the "Cambridge Humanists". But may we not have to go back still further?

The main argument of this book rests upon the conclusions of the first two chapters, and they are full of suggestive ideas. I fear none the less that they will satisfy only that sort of inquirer who would have been satisfied by something far less able. It doesn't take Dr Micklem's gifts to convince the man who from the outset shares Dr Micklem's presuppositions. If he troubles to think about natural theology he very often finds himself quite happy with the cosmological or design arguments in more or less traditional form. But if he feels that these are defective and is moreover unable to make sense of arguments from analogy, then we are in for a discussion of questions even more ultimate than those contained in this book. One way out (and it is more used and more "successful" than we often realize)

is to disclaim any desire to make the contents of Christian faith reasonable and to scorn those muddled people who think otherwise. Whatever may be said of this technique it is not a conspicuous example of Christians out-thinking their contemporaries. There are no little books to teach us how to do this. We are still perhaps much too far from grasping the magnitude and the seriousness and often the humility of contemporary honest unbelief to be able to turn the reflective sceptic from his ways.

This is not a criticism of *Ultimate Questions*. For the man it has in mind this is just the book, and it will be used with pleasure by the apologist who is unhappy with more conventional manuals. It is a criticism of our widespread failure to understand the thinking of that inquirer (maybe exceptional and maybe not) who knows more than we about the cards in his hand.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge. H. E. Root.

SHORTER NOTICES

Sancta Sanctorum: Prayers for the Holy of Holies. By W. E. Orchard. Dent. 12s. 6d.

These fifteen prayers supply a lack in Dr Orchard's *The Temple*, which he published forty years ago as a Free Church minister. The prayers in the earlier book were originally pulpit prayers, but proved themselves so acceptable for private devotion that they have been continually reprinted. The new prayers grew out of the author's private meditation, and are therefore much more personal. Under titles like "A Prayer in the Presence" they are extended colloquies, embodying reflections and aspirations, largely biblical in content. Though different people will use them in different ways, it is as a preparation for the real moment "when silence does actually supervene" in adoring communion, that they will find their justification.

Praying for Unity. By Olive Wyon. Edinburgh House Press. 1s.

The elegant exterior of this tract matches its contents, which gracefully and powerfully plead for a fuller recognition that the work of Christian unity is essentially supernatural. We know this well enough in theory, but heart and will remain often unmoved. One cannot imagine anyone who would not profit from reading and pondering these few pages.

The Threefold Gift of Christ. By "Brother Bernard". Edited and translated by a Religious of C.S.M.V. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d.

The "Brother" sets out to explain to his "dear priest of God" "how Christ when veiled and hidden on the altar under the form of bread, none the less abides in infinite . . . glory". However, this is no theological treatise, but a practical meditation on the great Christian Mysteries. Despite the translator's skill, it remains a rather pedestrian work, especially in comparison with the splendid, but all

too brief, extract from St Bernard of Clairvaux, which is wisely substituted for the original conclusion.

THE GREAT PRAYER. By Hugh Ross Williamson. Collins. 12s. 6d.

Mr Williamson believes that the Canon of the Roman Mass is a potential point of unity for all those who are separated from the Church, on the ground that all sects could unite in saying a prayer which was used by St Augustine when he came to Canterbury, and "no dissenter disagrees with the Catholic Church on the question of the original Christianity St Augustine brought to England". (Would that this were so!) Apart from such arguments, he is lively and readable as usual, as he comments à la Zundel on the prayers of the Canon. Nor has he written anything that he need now disown!

DELHI. J. D. M. STUART.

VERSES FROM ST AUGUSTINE OR SPECIMENS FROM A RICH MINE. By John Searle. Oxford University Press. 6s.

It was a happy idea to pick out gems from St Augustine's writings (mostly his sermons, letters and the Confessions) and to turn them into short verse-meditations. Some are translations, some paraphrases, some expansions of the originals (which are given). The turn of thought is always happy and suggestive; the versification is smooth and seldom calls for comment; the epigrammatic form gives crispness and penetrating power and is an aid to memory; and here and there is a pleasing touch of George Herbert. Here are some samples:

Dilige et quod vis fac—radix sit intus dilectionis, non potest de ista radice nisi bonum existere.

Love, then do what thou wilt,
Love cannot lead to guilt;
That rare celestial root
Must spring to heavenly fruit.

Da quod jubes et jube quod vis.

Make thy Will known to me.
Yet more I ask,
Lest thy Will prove for me
Too great a task.

Easy to bear
The lack of praise,
When walking in the world's secluded ways.
But should men smile,
And flatterers bring
Their gift of honeyed words, their incense swing;
Not easy then to scorn the keen delight;
Often have I been wounded in that fight.
Safer the lowly pew,
The preacher's chair how perilous, how few
Fit for their Master's cause,
Too pleased with man's applause:
So while I teach I tremble, lest I win
Praise that shall quench the fire of Truth within.

How can you grasp God's offering?
Your hands are full, they tightly cling
To coarser stuff—how can you gain
The new and still the old retain?
Let go the dross and grasp the gold,
Both at one time you cannot hold.

How highly men regard man's code of speech,
Yet lightly hold the law the Gospels teach.
To hate a brother man brings little blame,
But drop the h in "hominem"—what shame!

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

RINGWOOD.

I WENT TO MOSCOW. By Mervyn Stockwood. Epworth Press. 15s.

OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER. By Stephen Neill. World Christian Books. 2s.

I don't think the reader will be irritated by Canon Stockwood's somewhat ebullient account of his trip to Moscow. He might not himself presume to say of the two most powerful peoples in the world: "In fact the trouble with both of you is that you haven't grown up. When Russia and America behave like adults it will be easier for all of us to work together." But deep down he may well share the confidence in the British way of doing things with which Canon Stockwood surveys the Russian scene. He will certainly enjoy the courage and good humour with which he engages in debate with his hosts. And he will see Moscow through the eyes of a churchman and an enthusiast for social reform.

Dr Weatherhead went to Texas to deliver the lectures on which *Over His Own Signature* is based. He "gathered that . . . what was wanted each time was really a long sermon. . . . And since one of my besetting sins is to preach for far too long, it was wonderful to be allotted an hour for each talk." The strength of these sermons lies in the richness and the facility of the illustrations; the effect of the dawn on the gaudiness of a Roman feast; the agnostic scientist watching the ants; the picture of the devil at the chessboard; the Indian coolie finding salvation through a scrap of paper on which the words "bread of life" are written; the preacher's father-in-law at the Albert Hall; these and many other word-pictures stick in the memory. The method is an attractive one. Each sermon is based on one of our Lord's descriptions of himself: the Bread of Life, the True Vine, the Good Shepherd, the Truth, Meek and Lowly of Heart, and so on. But the sermons appear to lack the intellectual punch that we might reasonably demand of their distinguished author. "'The Word became flesh . . . and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth', or, if you like it better, 'full of winsomeness and sincerity'." I for one have a definite preference for "grace and truth".

"World Christian Books" are directed in the first place to the "younger churches", but the old distinction no longer really holds.

All Churches are faced by the same problems. In No. 6 of the series its General Editor outlines "the Christian Character" with his usual lucidity, depth and common sense. After an introductory chapter he allots a chapter each to love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control (Gal. 5. 22, 23). There is a trace of self-regard in the emphasis (p. 10 and p. 92) on the point that "when others look at us, they will see in us something of Christ". But the book may be confidently given, lent or sold to confirmation candidates, members of discussion groups and so on in the parishes. That may in the end prove to be its main usefulness. A teacher at the theological college in India of which Bishop Neill was once Principal recently expressed a doubt whether even such a book as this might not be too difficult for most of the students. But perhaps knowledge of the English language is advancing in Africa as surely and as swiftly as it is declining in some parts of Asia.

A. H. Dammers.

Palamcottah.

Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments. By Curt Kuhl. Francke Vetlag, Bern. N.p.

This introduction to the O.T. is published in a series (Sammlung Dalp) which is designed to give its readers an intelligible account of the present state of knowledge in various fields. In an introductory chapter the author gives short, but exceedingly clear and comprehensive, surveys of the authority which has been accorded to the O.T. throughout the ages; of the various critical methods applied in O.T. scholarship; of the way in which the O.T. has come down to us; of the formation of the canon; and of the different types of literary genre which make up the O.T. Dr Kuhl analyses the contents of each book of the O.T. and discusses composition, date, and authorship, a short essay on prophecy in Israel serving as a connecting link between the historical and prophetical books. In an appendix, those Apocryphal books which are contained in Luther's Bible are dealt with briefly. The value of the book is enhanced by a chronological table and copious notes which are relegated to the end of the book. Dr Kuhl has succeeded in writing a readable account of the complicated process of the growth of the O.T., which should be useful for the general reader as well as for the student.

K. H. Kuhn.

Durham.

Methodism and the Struggle of the Working Classes, 1850–1900. By Robert F. Wearmouth. Edgar Backus. 21s.

Despite its somewhat forbidding title, this is a valuable and absorbing book, and it is perhaps the most important in Dr Wearmouth's trilogy on the subject. The two earlier volumes (*Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century* and *Methodism*

and the Working Class Movement of England, 1800–1850) deal with periods which are already familiar in the writings of the economic and social historians, and the author's own *Some Working Class Movements of the Nineteenth Century* is largely confined to the first half of the period.

The method and arrangement followed in this latest work differ somewhat from those of the previous volumes, but the underlying scheme is similar. The author assembles three sets of data. He outlines the social, industrial and political conditions of the period, he describes the contemporary history of Methodism, and then devotes the third and major section of the book to the interrelationship between the first two. Unfortunately for those readers not already acquainted in detail with the subject, there is no attempt to put the Methodist contribution into perspective with those of the other Christian churches, or to assess it in relation to the secular reform movements of the 19th century. Too much is thus assumed of the wider canvas, while we are given a surfeit of quotations from official statistics and the reports of Royal Commissions, when much briefer examples would surely have served to paint the picture of the time.

But Dr Wearmouth is that *rara avis*, the painstaking and methodical research worker who is yet unafraid of his own beliefs and enthusiasms, and he certainly provides in this volume adequate reason for pride in the social concern of Methodism. It is to be hoped that he will give us what should be the most fascinating of all his works: "Methodism and the Social Revolution, 1900–1950."

Rosemary Hughes.

Bromley.

A History of Training for the Ministry of the Church of England. By F. W. B. Bullock. Budd and Gillatt, St Leonards-on-Sea. 20s.

In his *History of Ridley Hall* Canon Bullock produced much valuable, learned and accurate information about the history of training for the ministry during the 19th century. He has now widened his scope and published a historical handbook to the development of modern theological colleges between 1800 and 1874. It is a quarry rich in information, with many valuable references to rare and little-known books, and it offers fascinating glimpses into the life of the Church of England a century ago. To understand the prevailing ideas in any epoch about the training of the clergy is to go a long way towards understanding the history of the Church.

In 1845 the new Bishop of Chichester wished to close Chichester Theological College, which had then existed for some six years. Why? All the ablest men, he argued, were ordained simply upon their degree at the university, and therefore a college attracted to Chichester the border-line candidates whom the bishop might not want to draw into his diocese: and since both Oxford and Cambridge had recently enforced some theological instruction as a neces-

sary part of the training of the ordinand, the universities were doing, and doing better, all that his college might be supposed to be doing.

It requires at times some mental exertion to understand those points of view in the transitional days when the universities were still Anglican but when their inadequacy as training schools for all ordinands was already apparent. The exertion is healthy for anyone who thinks seriously about the same problem to-day.

Owen Chadwick.

Trinity Hall,
Cambridge.

St Maximus the Confessor. (Ancient Christian Writers, XXI.) Edited by Dom P. Sherwood. Longmans. 25s.

Dom Polycarp Sherwood has made himself a specialist on Maximus the Confessor, the 7th-century Byzantine monk who went to the African seaboard captured by the Greek Empire from the Vandals, and there fell under Roman influence, becoming protagonist of dyothelite resistance to imperial attempts at compromise with the Monophysites. Scholars seeking introduction to Maximus will find much useful guidance from this work, but for the general reader the Introduction and Notes seem astonishingly unsuitable. Dom Polycarp has already published at Rome (in *Studia Anselmiana*) two studies on Maximus. In the present work he assumes that anything said in the earlier two need not be repeated, and the reader of this volume is continually foiled unless he procures the other two. The hundred-page Introduction is really an essay on St Maximus in which is assumed knowledge of the historical background and of the Monothelite controversy. It is followed by just over 100 pages of translation. Certainly the *Liber Asceticus* and *Centuries on Love*, here Englished for the first time, offer a specimen of Maximus' approach to the devout life from which the modern Christian reader may gain help. And anyone who takes up this volume with good will can hardly grudge its cost.

W. Telfer.

Selwyn College,
Cambridge.

The Following Feet. By Ancilla. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

Ancilla, the anonymous authoress of *The Following Feet*, reveals the intimate spiritual experiences of a modern woman in search of a soul, while simultaneously bearing witness to the "unhurrying chase" of the Hound of Heaven.

She gives an honest and unflattering picture of herself at the age of forty-three, when the book begins, as "hard and brightly efficient", an intellectual woman of the agnostic-humanist school, perfectly integrated, and happy with the college lecturing she loves and many cultural interests to make her life, as she thought, complete.

Then while on holiday in Germany, out of a clear sky, comes the mystic experience or "Encounter" described many years later with the utmost conviction. For her it was the "knowing" once and for all—the world appearing as it had always been and yet wholly "other"—and, in a flash, the bliss of self-renunciation.

The rest of this account, thoughtful and often beautiful, covers the seven years during which she searches for an interpretation of her vision. She explores the writings of the mystics and of those who show any signs of "knowing", and a fascinating book list it makes. She seeks self-forgetfulness in war service and, what is particularly hard for one of her temperament, in expressing love in personal relationships. She looks for significance in her dreams (the accounts are curiously unpleasant, but perhaps helpful). She then reaches a half-defiant acceptance of her position as a "handmaid" of the Lord with the obedience it implies.

But the full meaning of the Incarnation and of the Cross has still to be faced. It is not until she has descended three times into the Valley of Humiliation and endured a particularly dark night of the soul that she is ready to see that sacramental religion within the Church of England is for her both the end of her search and the gateway to abundant life. Though by this time in her fifties, she now joyfully returns to being a child of God, and we rejoice with her as she consecrates her talents to his service.

This book will surely help other perplexed and over-complicated intellectuals to walk with patience and humility along the way (for them, so often labyrinthine) that, once begun, will bring them slowly but inexorably to "the tremendous Lover".

And what an ideal picture she gives us of Christian fellowship as she senses it, without fully understanding its source, when she is still a detached observer. She describes the members of the church she attends as "so gay, so free, and even when most austere, so humble, so loving"!

RUTH M. PALMER.

LONDON.

GESCHICHTE DER AUTOBIOGRAPHIE. By Georg Misch. Band II: Das Mittelalter. 1er Teil: Die Frühzeit. 1e Hälfte. Schulte-Bulmke, Frankfurt a/M., 1955.

To those who may be surprised that the medieval mind should have produced anything so self-conscious as autobiographies, Professor Misch replies that, although few of these have survived, evidently a large number must have perished through neglect, and goes on to combat the still current misconception that the Middle Ages were merely a thousand-year interlude between ancient and modern times.

In this, the first instalment of a biggish work (which is to rank with his *History of Autobiography in Antiquity*) he finds his material in early poems chiefly of a skaldic type and discusses the kinds of self-awareness attained by warrior leaders in two separate though not far from contemporary Heroic Ages: the Germanic and

Norse, associated with the *völkerwanderung*, and that of the Bedouin Arabs during the century preceding the rise of Islam.

The bearing and importance of this for general history? Well, the comparison of these two Heroic Ages is valuable (*a*) because, sociologically considered as well as ethnically, they had very different antecedents, and (*b*) with reference to the Crusades and other medieval encounters of Western Christendom with Islam. Again, these Germanic poems did more than reflect, they moulded, the spirit of Rome's overthrowers and were thus ancestral to the Parzifal legend and the medieval ideal of chivalry. HUGH BUSS.

MARNHULL.

THE PSEUDO-CYPRIANIC DE PASCHA COMPUTUS. Translated with brief annotations by George Ogg. S.P.C.K. 6s. 6d.

This Primitive Paschal Ready Reckoner is a reminder to those who think they might while away the time during a dull sermon trying to work out the date of Easter for themselves that there were times when such expedients were a necessity. Nowadays we take the conclusions of the calendars and lectionaries for granted. As it has reached us, this little work seems an odd combination of scientific treatise and sermon. The liturgical clichés are interesting, "die tertia" arguing to my mind a definitely Latin origin. There is also a definite "no connexion with next door" attitude with regard to the Jews.

What a pity the opportunity was missed by not including the text, since the apparatus assumes a text we have not got in front of us.

C. ST M. B. MACFARLANE.

LAPLEY.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *Prayers for Moral Welfare Work* [for public and private use] (2s.); Francis E. Barker, *Through the Ages. I. From the Beginning to the Reformation; II. From the Reformation to the Present Day* (2 vols, 12s. 6d. each).

EPWORTH PRESS: Vincent Taylor, *The Epistle to the Romans* (8s. 6d.).

GROSVENOR PRESS: Guy Daniel, *The Bible Story* (25s.).

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE: R. A. Harrisville, *The Concept of Newness in the New Testament* [Abstract of a dissertation] (n.p.).

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: John A. Mackay, *Protestantism* (50 cents).

S.C.M. PRESS: E. W. Heaton, *The Book of Daniel* (12s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: *Christ in the Concrete City* (3s. 6d.).

THAMES AND HUDSON: E. O. James, *The Nature and Function of Priesthood* (25s.).

THEOLOGICAL BOOK AGENCY (Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.): Bruce M. Metzger, *Jehovah's Witnesses and Jesus Christ* [Reprint from *Theology To-day*] (15 cents).

TYNDALE PRESS: E. F. Kevan, *The Evangelical Doctrine of Law* (1s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
BILLING & SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

Thomas Cranmer
Theologian

G. W. BROMILEY

An illuminating study of the great churchman and martyr, and a description of his permanent influence on the life and doctrine of the Christian religion in the British Isles. 12s. 6d.

Preaching the Gospel from the Gospels

G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY

The Gospels were written, Dr. Beasley-Murray asserts, because they were preached. To grasp this fact is to read the Gospels with new eyes. The reader is invited to stand alongside the men who first made known the Good News. 8s. 6d.

LUTTERWORTH

Adolf Schlatter

The Church in the New Testament Period

translated by P. P. Levertoff

21s. net

"It should be put straight into the hands of every theological student."

C. F. Evans, Fellow of Corpus Christi, Oxford

"The publication of this first volume of Schlatter's in English is one of the happiest moments of my career. It will be possible to to familiarize the undergraduates with the ideas of one of the greatest of Biblical scholars."

Professor Otto Piper, Princeton Theological Seminary

S · P · C · K

INTERNATIONAL SUMMER COURSES FOR THE CLERGY

at ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY

The Central College of the Anglican Communion

1956

First Session (July 9-21) GENERAL SUBJECTS.

Lecturers: Dean F. C. Synge (South Africa), Canon T. R. Milford (Lincoln), Rev G. F. S. Gray (Fellow of the College).

Second Session (July 23-August 4) CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

Lecturers: Dr F. H. Hilliard (University of London), Dr D. R. Hunter (New York), Rev J. C. Fenton (Wentworth, Yorks).

Third Session (August 6-18) COMMUNICATING THE GOSPEL.

Lecturers: Canon C. K. Sansbury (Warden), Canon T. O. Wedel (Washington), Dr W. R. Coleman (London, Ontario).

"*A wonderful source of inspiration and information.*"
Some participants in 1955.

Full details from:

The Secretary of the Summer Courses, St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, Kent.

FONDATION HARDT
ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

Volume I

LA NOTION DU DIVIN

DEPUID MOMÈRE JUSQU'À PLATON

SEVEN PAPERS AND DISCUSSIONS

by

H. J. ROSE, PIERRE CHANTRAINE, BRUNO SNELL, OLOF GIGON
H. D. F. KITTO, FERNAND CHAPOUTHIER, W. J. VERDENIUS

8vo viii+310 pages, cloth

£2 net

The first volume of a new series published by the 'Fondation Hardt pour l'Etude de l'antiquité classique', created a few years ago at Vandoeuvres-Geneva. Each of the seven 'Exposés' is followed by a discussion, all contributions being kept in the original English, French, or German

A detailed prospectus is available
Of all booksellers

Agents for the United Kingdom and the British Commonwealth

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD. 3-4 Petty Cury, Cambridge